

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
RAMONA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP**

A regular meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group (RCPG) was held March 5, 2009, at 7 p.m., at the Ramona Community Center, 434 Aqua Lane, Ramona, California.

In Attendance:	Chad Anderson	Chris Anderson	Torry Brean
	Matt Deskovick	Kathy S. Finley	Katherine L. Finely
	Dennis Grimes	Bob Hailey (arr 7:20)	Eb Hogervorst
	Kristi Mansolf	Jim Piva	Dennis Sprong
	Paul Stykel	Angus Tobiason	Richard Tomlinson

Chris Anderson, Chair of the RCPG, acted as Chair of the meeting. Kristi Mansolf, Secretary of the RCPG, acted as Secretary of the meeting.

ITEM 1: The Chair Called the Meeting to Order at 7:10 p.m.

ITEM 2: Pledge of Allegiance

ITEM 3: Oath of Office for Torry Brean, Filling Seat #15, Left Vacant by Beverly Maes

The Chair welcomed Torry Brean. He had been seated at the February 19, 2009, special meeting.

ITEM 4: The Secretary Determined a Quorum was Present

ITEM 5: LIST OF ABSENTEES FOR THIS MEETING. Determination of Excused and Unexcused Absences by the RCPG – Secretary Will Read Record Separately from the Minutes – No absences. Mr. Hailey would be late.

ITEM 6: Approval of Order of the Agenda (Action)

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA.

Upon motion made by Dennis Sprong and seconded by Matt Deskovick, the order of the agenda was **approved 14-0-0-1**, with no objections, with Bob Hailey absent.

ITEM 7: Roberts Rules of Order – Rules of Parliamentary Procedure to be Followed during Meeting. The Brown Act – General Information on What it is and How it Applies to the RCPG (Chair)

The Chair said Roberts Rules of Order govern how the RCPG meetings are conducted. The Brown Act defines how the public participates in the meeting.

ITEM 8: ANNOUNCEMENTS & Correspondence Received (Chair)

The Chair announced that she recently signed an amendment to a document pertaining to the issue of planning for major fires. This document will enable certain groups to apply for grant funds relating to planning for major fires.

Ms. Mansolf announced that there was Department of Planning and Land Use training for Planning and Sponsor Group members coming up beginning March 20. Every member has to attend 1

session to be indemnified as RCPG members. Sessions are very informative. Each member received a copy of the training information. Ms. Mansolf reminded RCPG members to turn in their Form 700's to the Registrar of Voters.

Ms. Mansolf announced that the North County Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) was out for public review with public comments due April 6. She has some discs available to interested parties. Much of Ramona is included in this Program. Part of Ramona is included in a different MSCP that was adopted in 1996 or 1997.

The Chair asked the AHOPE Subcommittee Chair to have a meeting to review the document.

ITEM 9: APPROVAL OF MINUTES 2-5-09, 2-19-09 (Action)

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 5 AND FEBRUARY 19, 2009.

Upon motion made by Kathy S. Finely and seconded by Dennis Sprong, the Motion **passed 13-0-2-0-0**, with Torrey Brean and Matt Deskovick abstaining.

ITEM 10. NON-AGENDA ITEMS Presentations on Land Issues not on Current Agenda (No Presentations on Ongoing Projects – These Must be Agendized)

Speaker: Chris Brown, Montecito Ranch Representative

Mr. Brown offered to take 3 people in a car, if interested, to tour the Montecito Ranch property. The project engineer and the project owner may also carry passengers. He wants to do this in an open forum. The project may be coming back to the RCPG in the next couple of months.

Ms. Anderson suggested giving the new members a packet of information on the project. It is okay to get educated on projects.

Mr. Brown asked for email addresses of those who are interested.

ITEM 11:. Presentation by County Staff on Stimulus Money Application for Intermountain Fire Dept., to Increase Size of Facility (Discussion and Possible Action)

Tom Fitzgerald is a representative for the San Diego County Fire Authority. They operate 30 fire stations in 13 fire jurisdictions. There is stimulus money available for building and upgrading fire stations. The County is applying for money to make a new station and modify some existing ones. There is the need for the project to be on the fast track. To qualify, projects must be shovel ready by a certain date. They are requesting a waiver of site plan review for the Intermountain Fire Dept. improvements. They are proposing to add 2400 additional square feet for offices and classrooms. Current sleeping quarters are used as classrooms. The bathroom will be retrofitted and a new one added.

Mr. Deskovick said that if the project receives a waiver, it won't come back. The RCPG doesn't like to give open waivers.

Mr. Fitzgerald said they will come back with the design. They must adhere to site plan requirements. All work proposed is listed on the waiver form.

The Chair said the project falls within the scenic corridor. She asked that they work with the Design Review Board (DRB) on design, color, and the other elements within the DRB purview.

Chief Coleman said that much of the sleeping quarters are used for storage. During the Witch Creek fire, 30 people slept in the apparatus bay. Chief Coleman said he will work with the DRB.

MOTION: TO RECOMMEND A WAIVER OF SITE PLAN FOR THE INTERMOUNTAIN VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT PROJECT AS FOLLOWS: PROPOSED 2400 SQ. FT. ADDITION TO EXISTING FIRE STATION: ADDITION WILL INCLUDE ONE ADDITIONAL APPARATUS BAY, CLASSROOM AND OFFICE AREA, AS WELL AS RETROFITTING EXISTING BATHROOMS AND POTENTIAL ADDING ONE ADDITIONAL BATHROOM. THIS IS A FAST TRACK PROJECT. THE DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE HAS AGREED TO WAIVE SITE PLAN REVIEW WITH THE COOPERATION OF YOUR COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Katherine L. Finley, the Motion **passed 15-0-0-0-0.**

ITEM 12: Consideration of Top 10 Road Infrastructure Project List for Capital Improvement Projects. Last List Submitted to DPW in July, 2005 (Discussion and Possible Action)(Also w/T&T 16-G-4)

Due to no one being in attendance for this item from the County, it was moved to under the Transportation/Trails Subcommittee, Item 16-G-4.

MOTION: TO MOVE #12 TO UNDER TRANSPORTATION/TRAILS.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Dennis Sprong, the Motion **passed 15-0-0-0-0.**

ITEM 13: Presentation by S. Norris on Major Use Permit Application for Daniel's West on SR 67. Project to be Submitted to the County (Discussion and Possible Action)

Ms. Norris is with TRS Consultants. Her presentation is informational and conceptual. She wants input on the proposed Major Use Permit proposal for Daniel's West at 17718 Hwy 67. The site is 4.78 acres, zoned A70. The scenic designator applies for the site. The existing store and parking area are not part of the permit application.

The project proposes the addition of 25 new parking spaces, a tasting room in the barn, and Boys and Girls Club soccer fields. There are no sports fields on the west end of Ramona currently. They are also proposing a farmers' market on the weekends. A grape vineyard will be intertwined throughout the site. The grapes will be used at the proposed winery. Most uses proposed are community uses. Existing oaks will be preserved. Windrows will be planted on the edge of the property. Runoff water will be captured with bioswales.

Kathy S. Finley asked about the proposed parking for the youth fields?

A representative for the project responded that parking will be placed around the fields. The proposed number of spaces meets the County requirement for the uses at the site. Park and Ride will be a separate parking area.

In response to the question of how much water the well on site produces, Mr. Vengler said that it was about 40 gallons a minute.

Mr. Tobiason said we need sport fields on the west end of town.

Mr. Stykel said Mr. Vengler always gives back to the community.

Mr. Sprong said access will be a challenge.

Mr. Stedt said the project is located on the inside of the curve. They are looking at a site distance correction.

Mr. Deskovick suggested using the existing easement road if possible to improve access and get more site distance.

Mr. Stedt said that the easement road is still on the inside curve.

Mr. Vengler said he met with the residents about the private road, and they didn't want it paved.

The Chair asked about the hours of operation for wine tasting?

Mr. Vengler said he doesn't know yet. As far as wineries, he wanted to have an event where vinters can come and showcase Ramona agriculture and wines once a month.

The Chair asked about the alcohol and the kids using the sports fields?

Mr. Vengler said wine tasting will be at 6 or 7 p.m. Sports will probably be over. There will be no lights on the sports fields.

Mr. Anderson said the barn used to be used for auctions. It has always been used for the public.

No action taken.

ITEM 14: TPM 20769R, Lot Split at 717 Haverford (at Pine) to Include Boundary Adjustment to Complete TPM Process. 2 Lots, 11.97 Acres. Bernie Thompson, Owner (Discussion and Possible Action)

Mr. Thompson said that he did a 2 lot split a few years ago that the RCPG approved but DPLU denied. He would have had to knock down a structure to satisfy the County at that time. He has redesigned the project to keep the structure and to move the project boundary.

Ms. Mansolf said the scoping letter came out and the only major project issue was that fire service may not be available within 5 years to serve the project. The project is just a 2 lot split. On the availability form for fire services, the box is checked saying services may not be available in 5 years, but another box is checked saying fire service is available.

Mr. Thompson had not seen the scoping letter yet.

The Chair said it looked as though someone had checked the wrong box on the form, since the information did not agree.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE REPLACEMENT MAP.

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the Motion **passed 15-0-0-0-0.**

ITEM 15: AD 09-002, Rancho San Vicente Sign Enhancements. To Install One On Premise, New Sign; and One Off Premise, Replacement Sign Identifying the RSV Community (Discussion and Possible Action)

Ms. Mansolf announced the proponent would be late due to having another meeting prior to the RCPG.

MOTION: TO MOVE THIS ITEM TO LATER IN THE AGENDA WHEN THE APPLICANT WOULD BE IN ATTENDANCE.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Bob Hailey, the Motion **passed 14-1-0-0-0,** with Matt Deskovick voting no.

ITEM 16: SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

16-A: WEST (Mansolf) (No Business)

16-B: SOUTH (Hailey) (No Business)

16-C: EAST (Kathy S. Finley)(No Business)

16-D: PARKS (Tomlinson) (No Business)

16-E: GP Update Plan (Anderson)

16-E-1: Report on Steering Committee Meeting 2-28-09

The Chair attended the Steering Committee meeting on February 28, and said there is great information and resources available to the Planning and Sponsor Groups. She is compiling resource information for RCPG members.

16-F: CUDA (Brean)(Action Items)

16-F-1: S91-050M3, Stater Bros. Minor Deviation for Relocation of Existing Grease Interceptor and Existing Trash Compactor, Addition of a New Truck Dock and Ramp to an Existing Emergency Exit. Owner: Stater Bros.

Ms. Mansolf gave the CUDA Subcommittee report. The applicant wasn't present due to living out of the area, but would have attended the RCPG meeting if there were any unanswered concerns identified at the CUDA meeting. No concerns were identified at CUDA. The project includes remodeling the existing deli/bakery in the store, and modifications to the outside of the store that appeared would not have any negative impacts to the community. The following motion from CUDA was brought forward:

MOTION: TO APPROVE AS SUBMITTED.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Kathy S. Finley, the Motion **passed 15-0-0-0-0.**

ITEM 15: AD 09-002, Rancho San Vicente Sign Enhancements. To Install One On Premise, New Sign; and One Off Premise, Replacement Sign Identifying the RSV Community (Discussion and Possible Action)

The proponent being in attendance, the item was brought forward.

The proponent said that one sign would be placed on Vista Ramona. A second sign would be placed at the east end of Arena Way. The signs would be integrated into the site with the existing boulders. The granite will be flame finished. The signs will be 8 feet wide and 4 feet high. There will be led lights – 3 watts on each sign. There will be landscaping around the signs.

The Chair said the Design Review Board approved the signs as submitted.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE SIGN ENHANCEMENTS AS PRESENTED.

Upon motion made by Kathy S. Finley and seconded by Bob Hailey, the Motion **passed 15-0-0-0-0.**

16-F-2: STP 09-005, Palomar Pomerado Health, Ramona Satellite Clinic, Main St., Contact is Richard Miller, MetroPlan. 2.6 acres. D5 Special Area Regulation Applies, 2 Story Clinic, 37,500 sq. ft. Access to be from Main St. and from 13th and 14th St. (w/T&T)

A presentation was given by the applicant at the T&T meeting for both the T&T and CUDA Subcommittees. Following the presentation, CUDA convened and discussed the project. No other concerns were identified other than traffic. It was suggested xeriscaping be used for the landscaping because water usage will be tightening up in the future, and the landscaping must be sustainable. A median on Main St. was recommended so left turns in and out of the facility would be precluded. Main St. access was considered problematic. It was stated that this is a good project but in the wrong area due to traffic concerns. Nickelcreek is an approved project to possibly be built down 14th St. in the future, then there are the existing apartments and the supermarket/shopping center. The 14th St./Main St. intersection is already really impacted. The RICC and the library will be going in at 13th. CUDA motion reflected the T&T motion.

Mr. Piva said the T&T Subcommittee approved the project in concept but wanted the applicants to come back as traffic issues are addressed in the future for review. No traffic engineer was at the T&T meeting to answer questions.

Rich Miller presented the project. A 2004 referendum was passed that supported PPH. In the past 5 years, they have been planning and looking for the best site to place the facility. The site chosen will have access points on 14th, 13th, and Main St. The property is zoned C-36 and the project is within the guidelines of this zone and conforms to the General Plan and the Community Plan. They are working on their environmental document which will be out for public review soon. The building is 37,000 sq ft and 2 story. There were some concerns voiced at the T&T meeting with people going through the back of the site. 169 parking spaces are required and provided. There will be no peak hours for business at the facility. People will have appointments. A courtyard is proposed outside of the building. The Centre for Health is across the street.

A traffic engineer for the project discussed traffic. A traffic study has been prepared. Hwy 67 was analyzed. Seven road segments were studied and 5 key intersections. There will be no impact outside of the Community from the project. They looked at 96 cumulative projects being proposed for Ramona when considering the project. Some may not go forward. The traffic study specifies a right turn in and out. When they look at the final design, they will formalize the plan. 14th St. is signalized. There were found to be no direct impacts and some cumulative impacts.

Mr. Tobiason asked about widening 14th St.?

The traffic engineer said the project access meets the minimum requirements for setbacks for the corridor. No comments have come back from the County.

Mr. Deskovick said the concept of the outpatient facility is great. He'd like to see a more rustic building – not so contemporary – to better fit Ramona.

The proponent said they tried to have a design to fit Ramona.

Mr. Deskovick would like to see no access on Main St. The one lot can access both 13th and 14th St. Will a project requirement be to pave 13th St.?

The proponent doesn't know what the requirements are for 13th St.

Mr. Grimes has a large vehicle, as do many people in Ramona. Can the spaces in the parking lot be diagonal rather than parallel?

The proponent said they won't meet their required parking yield if spaces are not parallel.

Mr. Brean believes access to 13th will have to be paved. He also felt the building did not look rural and would prefer a rustic design.

Ms. Kathy S. Finley asked about the Fire Department accessing the property off Main St.?

The proponent said the Fire Department likes the access on Main St. and the other 2 access points. There are 2 accesses for fire trucks.

Ms. Kathy S. Finley said the people in the clinic may need an ambulance.

Ms. Mansolf asked if the applicant had talked to Cal Trans? Cal Trans will have specific requirements for a Main St. access. The property has a D5 designator that limits curb cuts on Main St. Parking spaces should be full size and not compact.

The traffic engineer said they have not talked to Cal Trans yet. Another member of the project team said parking spaces will not be compact. The applicants are aware of the D5 designator requirement.

The Chair said the project didn't make it to Design Review and will come next month. When her office on the corner of 10th and Main was built, there was a curb cut on Main, but instead the office takes access from the alley off 10th. This has worked really well. She felt Main St. access should be limited or removed.

Mr. Stykel invited the applicants to the Town Center meetings. Median designs are being considered. Cal Trans will take care of Main St. Design Review will help look at the project design.

Ms. Katherine L. Finley asked about trees for shade and wells on the site?

Mr. Tomlinson asked about the brick front?

The applicant responded that the brick would be textured masonry. The proponents met with the owner of D'Carlos and discussed grading and drainage. The owner is concerned he may have to meet the same standards as the PPH facility along Main St.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE PPH SATELLITE CONCEPT AND REQUEST THAT THE PROPONENTS MUST COME BACK FOR TRANSPORTATION/TRAILS REVIEW ONCE THE CIRCULATION CONCERNS ARE ADDRESSED, AND CONTINGENT UPON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD CONFORMANCE.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Dennis Sprong, the Motion **passed 14-1-0-0-0**, with Torry Brean voting no.

16-F-3: TPM 20990RPL, 1512 Walnut St. 4 Lots, Site is 4 Acres. Turnkey Homes, Owner (w/T&T)

Ms. Mansolf said the County planner says the RCPG never approved or denied the project. The project was seen by the RCPG in 2006 and concerns were identified relating to drainage, an odd shaped lot, and the hammerhead turnaround rather than a cul de sac (the hammerhead was approved by the Fire Department). In December, 2008, this item was on the agenda because the County required 10 feet of dedicated right of way along Walnut St., and the RCPG asked that this 10 feet of right of way be used as a pathway. Due to having to give up the 10 feet, the project was reconfigured a little, and access was changed. Mr. Simmons had wanted to see it again in December and the applicant did not attend, so only the pathway was acted upon.

The project is going to connect to the sewer system with the proposed subdivision. Currently the property is on septic.

Mr. Opterra, project consultant, said at the Subcommittee meeting that access has moved about 30 to 50 feet, and there will be 2 16-foot driveways with a fence in between for access. This also has been approved by the Fire Department.

Comments from the Subcommittee were it would be better to get rid of the fence and put asphalt down, connecting the 2 driveways. There were concerns about the water draining onto a neighboring property. Currently the water drains naturally from the proposed project site onto the neighbor's property. What will prevent the property from getting flooded?

Mr. Opterra said there will be a grassy bioswale that will catch much of the water. There will be a little area to catch water at the base of the house, also. There will be drainage along the driveway. The goal is to slow down the velocity of the water.

CUDA felt concerns were addressed.

T&T had asked if there was a way to put a trail through the project to connect to the Greenway. A setback for the Creek is on the property. There was discussion on how the owner could lose one lot by placing a trail on the property as the County would count the loss against the acreage requirement for the project. The T&T Subcommittee made the following motion:

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE PROJECT. WE DON'T SEE ANY NEGATIVE IMPACTS TO THE COMMUNITY.

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the Motion **passed 14-0-1-0-0**, with Richard Tomlinson abstaining.

16-G: Transportation/Trails (Piva)(Action Items)

16-G-1:STP 09-005, Palomar Pomerado Health, Ramona Satellite Clinic, Main St., Contact is Richard Miller, MetroPlan. 2.6 acres. D5 Special Area Regulation Applies, 2 Story Clinic, 37,500 sq. ft. Access to be from Main St. and from 13th and 14th St. (w/CUDA)

16-G-2:TPM 20990RPL, 1512 Walnut St. 4 Lots, Site is 4 Acres. Turnkey Homes, Owner Walnut St. (w/CUDA)

16-G-3:SDGE / Safety Letters – Presentation by Joe Cahak (*Taken Out of Order*)

**16-G-4.Consideration of Top 10 Road Infrastructure Project List for Capital Improvement Projects. Last List Submitted to DPW in July, 2005
Other Circulation Element Roads may be added to the List that were not Called out above, i.e., the SA 603 (North Bypass) Last List Submitted to DPW in July, 2005 (Also w/Item 12 Above)**

A. Intersection of Dye Rd (Ramona St. to San Vicente);

B. Southern Traffic By-Pass (Warnock to Keyes to Hwy 78);

C. San Vicente Rd., ½ Way Down to “S” Turns (Warnock Dr. to 5000 feet South);

D. 13th St. Paving (SR 67 to Walnut St);

E. Post Office Access (Montecito Crt/Extension of 15th St to new “E” St across 16th St. to Ramona St.;

F. Ramona St, Boundary to Warnock;

G. San Vicente Rd (Wildcat Cyn Rd to SDCE);

H. San Vicente Rd (5000 feet South of Warnock Dr to Wildcat Cyn Rd;

I. Dye Rd. (SR 67/Mussey Grade to Dye Rd);

J. Montecito Rd at Main – Construct a Right Turn Ln.

Other Circulation Element Roads may be added to the List that were not Called out above, i.e., the SA 603 (North Bypass) (Discussion and Possible Action)

Mr. Piva said the T&T Subcommittee voted to keep the top 10 list as is. Mr. Deskovick gave a presentation on Ramona St. and the emergency access road.

Speaker: Ken Brennecke, Ramona Resident

Mr. Brennecke read a letter into the record. The T&T Subcommittee looked at the Ramona St. Extension project in depth. No new information was presented. New members were not familiar

with the issues. Mr. Brennecke said the project affects his property and the County is waiving their design standards if they put the project in. The design is flawed.

Speaker: Patricia Brennecke, Ramona Resident

Ms. Brennecke would like to see the Ramona St. Extension project come off of the top 10 list. There are only 2 alternatives for the project design, and for Mr. Zielanski, there are no alternatives. Lowering the aquaduct is expensive. Now the design has critical design flaws. As stated by Supervisor Jacob, this project will be expensive – the money would be better spent for something else. She has heard the RCPG and T&T Subcommittee say they want the road extended no matter what. She felt the money would be better spent on something more critical. There are so many flaws now.

Speaker: Suzi Paul, Ramona Resident

Ms. Paul lives in the project vicinity for the Ramona St. Extension project. She wants this road removed from the top 10 list. She's been to 2 meetings of the T&T Subcommittee and the RCPG. She heard we have to keep the top 10 list as is or lose credibility with the County. She asked that the project be taken off the top 10 list or redesigned.

Speaker: Donna Myers, Ramona Resident

Ms. Myers said that several of the projects on the top 10 list impact the Dye Rd. area. No one has awareness of that area. No one from the area has been encouraged to participate in this process. Supervisor Jacob chastised the County – why were people not in on the first tier of the Ramona St. Extension project? We are destroying the Dye Rd. area. When we first voted on the project, we didn't know. Only Mr. Deskovick has come to look at the project. Ms. Myers asked to have the project staked so people can see where it goes. It is not fair to fight Mr. Zielanski.

Mr. Deskovick reiterated his presentation to the RCPG. The RCPG had a motion in December that was unclear to the County. Our issue was the amount of fill and encroachment on the parcels. Mr. Zielanski did not look at the option of cutting the road down and lowering it. Mr. Deskovick must have mis-spoke in December. We had said not to lower the road, but to lower the pipe. He talked to Ken Brazell about this issue. When Mr. Zielanski came to the RCPG, he didn't know how much fill would be added. We thought it would be 12 feet. At the County he learned it would be 8 feet. The County won't do anything unless we ask. Mr. Deskovick wants to make a motion to lower the road. Now the design is for fill on top of fill. If we have a new motion on this project, the County will consider it to see if they can make it work. There will still be encroachment, but it won't be so bad if the road is lowered. We should reconsider our previous motion.

Mr. Tobiason said that there are several other roads on the top 10 list that are more important than Ramona St.

Ms. Kathy S. Finley asked if we keep Ramona St. Extension on the top 10 list, will it just stay on the list and not get done?

The Chair said that the paving of 13th St. has been on the list for 100 years – and it is still on the list. We can maybe get Ramona St. Extension engineered right, but it will take longer to get built. The money won't go to another community.

Ms. Kathy S. Finley wants to see the road stay on the list.

Mr. Tomlinson said that we shouldn't fight the County for good engineering. If the project is flawed, it shouldn't go ahead. It is not our job to redesign the project.

Ms. Mansolf said that the Community lost 14th St. improvements because we rejected the design. We asked the County to modify the design and now it is gone. Mr. Zielanski said that the Ramona St. Extension project as proposed has stopped moving forward because we asked for 2 modifications to the design which would require a new design. Also, we may want to think about putting A St. on the top 10 list. With the proposed developments in that area, we could use another road going through. A St. is on the County's CIP road project list (online) but only for preliminary engineering. It is not on our list, so A St. may go away.

Mr. Sprong asked about the modified 603 replacing 13th St. on the top 10 list?

It was stated that 13th St. needs a bridge, which is very expensive.

Mr. Tobiason said that if the SA 603 were built from Montecito Way to Rangeland, 25 percent of the traffic evacuating Ramona could leave that way.

Mr. Hailey said that he felt the extension of A St. and also 13th St. are the most important roads to be considered for improvements with the impact of all of the development going into that area. People will need access. Both roads should be on our top 10 list.

Mr. Deskovick said that the RCPG doesn't want to give up the extension of Montecito Rd. without an emergency access road provided in its place. We don't want all of the SA 603, but a modified version. The Airport project rescheduled until next month. He wants the SA 603 on the table and on the map. Then we can give them Montecito Rd. Mr. Deskovick asked Chris Brown, Montecito Ranch representative, if there were engineering studies that could help to facilitate possible road alignments for an emergency access road north of the Airport?

Mr. Brown said he would be happy to work on this. The Nature Conservancy didn't want a road or trail on the property. Now the County owns the land.

The Chair said land going north from the Airport is not as sensitive.

Mr. Tobiason said he saw the SA 603 on a map for a project recently. The 603 went across Montecito Rd. to Rangeland.

Mr. Brean felt the word 'emergency' should be deleted. We want access. This road should be on the top 10 list.

Mr. Anderson said the County has to get rid of the easement. This is an opportunity to get a road.

Mr. Sprong said the FAA will get Montecito Rd. vacated whether we want them to or not.

Mr. Hailey said we need connectivity.

Mr. Deskovick said that the RCPG didn't want the 603. But the situation changed due to the fire 2 years ago. We have changed our minds, so the wildfire issue is part of our reasoning. We didn't have this perspective 10 years ago.

MOTION: TO PROMOTE THE TOP 10 LIST DATED JULY 7, 2005, WITH NO PRIORITIZATION.

(Discussion on the Motion)

MOTION: TO CALL THE QUESTION ON THE MOTION.

Upon motion made by Bob Hailey and seconded by Jim Piva, the Motion **passed 15-0-0-0-0.**

(Voting on the Original Motion)

Upon motion made by Jim Piva and seconded by Torry Brean, the Motion **passed 15-0-0-0-0.**

MOTION: TO RECONSIDER THE MOTION FROM 12-4-08 ON RAMONA ST. EXTENSION: THE RCPG MAINTAINS THE SUPPORT OF THE RAMONA STREET EXTENSION PROJECT. TO RECOMMEND TO THE COUNTY (WITH OR WITHOUT OUR HELP) THEY RE-ENGINEER/REDESIGN THE ROAD WITH THE LEAST AMOUNT OF IMPACT TO THE NEIGHBORS AND INCLUDE LOWERING THE AQUADUCT AS PART OF THE PROJECT.

Vote tally from 12-4-08: Upon motion made by Matt Deskovick and seconded by Andrew Simmons, the Motion passed 10-4-0-0-1, with Torry Brean, Carolyn Dorroh, Vivian Osborn and Angus Tobiason voting no, and Katherine L. Finley absent.

Upon motion made by Matt Deskovick and seconded by Bob Hailey, the Motion **passed 15-0-0-0-0.**

MOTION: THE RCPG MAINTAINS THE SUPPORT OF THE RAMONA STREET EXTENSION AND REQUESTS THE COUNTY LOWERING THE NATURAL GRADE OF RAMONA STREET AT THE HIGHEST POINT OF APPROXIMATELY 8 FEET TO MINIMIZE THE ENCROACHMENT OF THE FILL SLOPES ON THE NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES AND TO REDUCE THE VISUAL IMPACT OF AN 8 FOOT FILL ABOVE THE EXISTING GRADE. WE UNDERSTAND THE ELEVATION OF AN AQUADUCT AND WATER MAIN SHOULD BE ADDRESSED.

Upon motion made by Matt Deskovick and seconded by Torry Brean, the Motion **passed 9-6-0-0-0,** with Chris Anderson, Katherine L. Finley, Jim Piva, Dennis Sprong, Paul Stykel, and Richard Tomlinson voting no.

MOTION: AFTER THE LAST WILDFIRES, THE EMERGENCY EVACUATION OF RAMONA WAS GREATLY IMPAIRED. THE COMMUNITY OF RAMONA IS IN DIRE NEED OF AN ALTERNATIVE ACCESS TO EVACUATE RAMONA. WE, THE BOARD, WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A MODIFICATION OF THE SA 603 FROM RANGELAND RD. TO MONTECITO WAY FOLLOWING THE SOUTH BORDER OF THE MONTECITO RANCH PROPERTY. THE SA 603 FROM MONTECITO WAY TO HWY 78 THROUGH CEDAR AND RANGELAND TO BANDY CANYON TO REMAIN DELETED FROM THE GP UPDATE MAP.

Upon motion made by Matt Deskovick and seconded by Bob Hailey, the Motion **passed 15-0-0-0-0.**

16-G-3:SDGE / Safety Letters – Presentation by Joe Cahak (*Taken Out of Order*)

The T&T Subcommittee reviewed the safety letter prepared by Joe Cahak regarding safety issues in the right-of-way for SDG&E utility components. Mr. Hickman commended Joe Cahak for following through on this issue, the County supports this action, and this action puts SDGE on notice that these changes will happen. Mr. Piva said that according to Mr. Cahak, some of the roads have expanded, and now the poles are too close to the road. The following motion from the Subcommittee was put forward:

MOTION: TO SUPPORT THE LETTER AUTHORED BY JOE CAHAK IN AN EFFORT TO PUT ADDED POLITICAL PRESSURE ON SDG&E.

Upon motion made by Jim Piva and seconded by Dennis Sprong, the Motion **passed 15-0-0-0-0.**

Ms. Mansolf said Bob Goralka of DPW volunteered to write a grant for developing community right of way development standards for Ramona. Other communities that have developed right of standards included Julian, Fallbrook, San Dieguito and Borrego Springs. Mr. Goralka would like a letter of support from the RCPG to send with the grant.

MOTION: TO WRITE A LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR A GRANT APPLICATION FOR DPW TO DEVELOP COMMUNITY RIGHT OF WAY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR RAMONA.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Kathy S. Finley, the Motion **passed 15-0-0-0-0.**

16-H: DESIGN REVIEW (Anderson) – Update on Projects Reviewed by the Design Review Board

The Chair gave a brief update.

16-I: TOWN CENTER COMMITTEE (Brean, Stykel) Update on Town Center Committee Meetings – Report to RCPG

Mr. Stykel reported on the Town Center Committee meeting. There will be concerns in Ramona. Considerations are being given to center medians on Main St. More trees will be planted.

ITEM 17: OTHER BUSINESS – None

ITEM 18: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (Chair)

- A. Names Submitted for New Subcommittee Members (Action)**
- B. Agenda Requests**
- C. Concerns of Members**
- D. Discussion of RCPG Representation to the County and Others**

The Chair encouraged everyone to go to the training so they can better understand what the RCPG is doing and so they can be indemnified by the County if they get sued. There are policies that govern the RCPG, such as Policy I-1, Policy I-1A and the RCPG Standing Rules.

RCPG member shouldn't go to the County and speak on behalf of the RCPG – the Chair is the official spokesperson for the RCPG. In the past, Chairs of Subcommittees and Subcommittee members have relayed information to the County as though they have authority. Motions have been mis-stated. If there is an item that needs RCPG representation at the County and the Chair isn't available, someone can be sent to represent the RCPG, but only with a letter signed by the Chair designating the person to be a representative. This would be done by a majority vote.

She asked Subcommittee Chairs to let their members know they can't represent the RCPG to the County.

RCPG members can't accept money or gifts, such as free lunches or even coffee. If a member lives next door to a project, they should step down. County Counsel won't protect us if we go outside of the RCPG rules. If a field trip is planned to view a project, a quorum can't be present unless the meeting is properly agendized. There have been violations in the past. We don't want violations in the future. If an RCPG member has made over \$250 on a project in the last 12 months, they need to recuse themselves from the discussion and the vote, and if they want to speak, they need to speak from the audience. If the Chair hears that someone is in violations of the rules, she will let them know.

There were further questions on what would constitute violating the rules.

The Chair said to bring these questions to the training.

ITEM 19: ADJOURNMENT – 10:30

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf